DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 943 CS 002 095

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.; Manzo, Anthony V., Ed.
TITLE Doctoral Programs in Reading: Student Characteristics, Admission Criteria, and Degree Requirements; Evaluation of Doctoral Training Experiences by the A. Victims, B. Victors (Choose One); Some Criteria for Evaluating Reading Doctoral Programs; and How Does Your Program Rate?
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 46p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v2 n1 Entire Issue Dec 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Programs; Employment Opportunities; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Professors; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

The "Epistle" is the Publication Forum of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators, which is a special-interest group of the International Reading Association. This issue is concerned with information on the status of graduate reading programs, particularly doctoral programs. Articles are "Doctoral Programs in Reading: Student Characteristics, Admission Criteria, and Degree Requirements," by Robert A. Palmatier and Anthony V. Manzo; "Evaluation of Doctoral Training Experiences," by recent graduates; "Some Criteria for Evaluating Reading Doctoral Programs," by Richard Allington; and "How Does Your Program Rate?" by Robert A. Palmatier, which is a summary of a section of a doctoral program evaluation survey conducted by Palmatier and Manzo. Regular features are Moyers, which endeavors to record the job choices of new graduates and the relocation of others; Exchange, which offers a communication link between individuals who wish temporary locations; and Job Report, which lists positions available to doctoral-degree holders. (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110943

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

epistle

vol. 2, no. 1

december 1974

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators

International Reading Association

CS 002 095

EPISTLE
VOL. 2, NO. 1

Coordinating Editor
Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

Co-Editor
Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri - Kansas City

Advisory Editors
Lawrence Carrillo
San Francisco State University

H. Alan Robinson
Hofstra University

Editorial and Research Assistant
Joyce Johnston
University of Georgia

Correspondence: EPISTLE
Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Additional copies of
EPISTLE are available
for $1.50 to members
and for $2.00 to
non-members.

Printer of EPISTLE is the
University of Georgia
Central Duplicating Service
Athens, Georgia 30602

Professors of Reading
Teacher Educators

Vol. 2, No. 1 December 1974

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

Doctoral Programs in Reading: Student Characteristics, Admission Criteria, and Degree Requirements
Robert A. Palmatier and Anthony V. Manzo

Evaluation of Doctoral Training Experiences by the
A. Victims; B. Victors (Choose One)
Jack L. Burtch, George Canney, Gretchen Crafts, Patricia Cunningham, Larry D. Ditto, Lance M. Gentile, Walter J. Lamberg, Linda Leonard Lamme, Etta Miller, Jerome A. Niles, Robert J. Tierney, and Joseph L. Vaughan, Jr.

Some Criteria for Evaluating Reading Doctoral Programs
Richard Allington

And How Does Your Program Rate?
Robert A. Palmatier

Regular Features

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities

MOVERS: A Chronicle of Professional Relocations

JOB REPORT

EDITORIAL COMMENT

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

EPISTLE

December 1974
Vol. 2, No. 1

Dear Colleagues:

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators received official approval at the November board meeting as a special interest group of the International Reading Association. We look forward to growing support as we endeavor to provide a focal point for those working in graduate education programs in reading and related areas.

Unexpected delay in both the editing and printing stages causes this issue to be greatly delayed. Hopefully with new printing arrangements catching up will be possible by the third issue in this volume.

This issue continues the effort to disseminate information on the status of graduate reading programs, particularly doctoral programs. A second report from the survey completed by Palmatier and Manzo is the lead article in this issue.

Consumerism is popular everywhere today, so why not in doctoral programs? The results from a request for evaluation of training experiences by recent graduates gives an inside view of doctoral preparation.

After commenting on the program evaluations reported in the last EPISTLE, Richard Allington generated some of his own criteria for program evaluation. His suggestions are included in guidelines for prospective doctoral students to use in selecting a program to meet their training needs.

Regular Features, Movers, Exchange, Editorial Comment, Time Capsule and About the Authors are joined by a new department, Job Report. Several early openings in college teaching of reading are listed.

As 1975 commences, a call for renewal and new membership is being issued. The loyal support of our charter members has been most gratifying and appreciated. Due to our lagging publication output we have been able to extend the initial membership year to eighteen months. However, this issue is the last for the initial membership term. Two membership blanks are included in this volume. Please renew your membership with one and pass the other on to someone else. Since the contents of the EPISTLE are equally applicable to doctoral students preparing for

jobs in reading education, we suggest you introduce the idea of membership in Professors of Reading Teacher Educators to your doctoral candidates as well as to fellow faculty members. The four dollar membership fee cannct be maintained as our publishing costs have been increased due to the necessity of changing printers and expanded content of EPISTLE. Thus, six dollars is being requested for new and renewal memberships.

Again we seek manuscripts. Any aspect of program development, operation, or need is within our interest area. The usefulness of this forum is dependent upon the representative variety of the articles presented.

Cordially,

Robert A. Palmatier
Chairman

Anthony V. Manzo
Coordinating Editor

Doctoral Programs in Reading: Student Characteristics, Admission Criteria, and Degree Requirements

Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri - Kansas City

A survey of doctoral program characteristics was called for at the initial meeting of the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association. This is the second report emanating from that survey. An earlier report on aspects relating to program organization and faculty appeared in Volume I, Number 2 of the EPISTLE. The present report deals with student characteristics, admission criteria, and degree requirements.

Data reported for this portion of the survey, as in the earlier report, came from eighteen institutions representing each major geographic region. Together these institutions report an enrollment of over 300 doctoral students with major concentration in reading. This represents a substantial base from which to project generalizations. As indicated in Table 1, only a slight increase in doctoral student enrollment seems evident over the three year period from 1972-73 to the present academic year.

Table 1

Doctoral Program Enrollment of 18 Reporting Institutions

Year	Enrollment		
	Range	Mean	Total
1972-73	4 to 55	17.5	315
1973-74	5 to 51	18.9	340
1974-75 (anticipated)	6 to 45	18.7	337

Twelve graduate reading programs indicated a cumulative total of 292 doctorates awarded through the end of the 1973-74 school year. The total number awarded by each institution ranged from three to ninety, with seven of the twelve institutions reporting between ten and twenty doctoral graduates over their program's entire history. Comparing the total to date (292) with the anticipated number of doctorates to be awarded in the 1975 commencement, it is likely that the total pool of reading doctorates could

be doubled in one year.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Table 2 indicates a relatively consistent picture of credentials used for judging the admission of potential doctoral candidates. Fourteen of the eighteen institutions surveyed utilize graduate grade averages and recommendations. An interview is a usual admission criteria for twelve of the reporting programs. Graduate Record Examination Scores, undergraduate grade averages, and teaching experience are used for making program admission decisions by eleven of the reporting institutions. Nine programs reported use of the Miller Analogies Test. Departmental exams and samples of written work were required by less than half of the respondents. There does not appear to be a single unanimously agreed upon criterion for program admission. Rather, an eclectic approach seems prevalent.

Table 2

Criteria Used For Determining Admission to Doctoral Programs

Criteria	Number of Institutions Using
Miller Analogies Test	9
Graduate Record Exam	11
Grade Point Average (Graduate)	14
Grade Point Average (Undergraduate)	11
Teaching Experience	11
Recommendations	14
Interview	12
Departmental Examination	3
Sample of Written Work	1

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Seventeen programs reported a total enrollment of 42% male and 58% female students. The fifteen institutions reporting on marital status of doctoral students indicated that on the average

66% were married, 27% single, and 7% divorced.

All but two of the twelve schools reporting background educational experiences indicated that their candidates typically had more than two years of prior teaching experience. The largest group of candidates falls in the range of two to five years of teaching experience. The same programs indicated that a majority (40% to 80%) of the candidates came from elementary school teaching backgrounds. The next highest group was secondary (10% to 50%), with students from junior college, pre-school, and adult education backgrounds receiving only incidental mention.

In response to a question regarding pre-doctoral work experience, sixteen of eighteen institutions reported that 100% of their candidates were previously public school teachers. One program indicated that 20% of its candidates came from tutorial/clinical backgrounds and 10% from private/parochial schools. Only one institution indicated that any (10%) of its doctoral students had taught in private/parochial school settings.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The only point of total consensus among institutions was in the requirement of a doctoral thesis. All eighteen reporting institutions demand a thesis of both Ph.D. and Ed.D. candidates. The next most agreed upon requirement (fifteen institutions) was statistics as a research tool. A minimum of 90 semester or 120 quarter hour credits, one year full-time residency, and research competency were listed as requirements by eleven of the reporting institutions. The only other item agreed upon as a requirement by at least half (nine) of the programs was a college teaching practicum. Table 3 details frequency of selection for these and other less often mentioned requirements.

Responses to queries regarding specific course requirements suggests rather different conceptualization of the doctoral degree. When asked if and how many courses were required in social, philosophical, and cultural foundations of education, only fourteen institutions responded. Six said, "none." Eight indicated requirements ranging from two to six courses.

When asked to indicate the number of courses from outside the college of education required in a doctoral program of study, only one institution stated a specific requirement. In the single case reported, a non-education minor is required of doctoral students but only for Ph.D. candidates.

An open-ended question on other non-course requirements elicited two mentions of examinations, one mention of a professional internship, with single mention of several knowledge areas including administration, linguistics, cognitive psychology, phonetics, and psycholinguistic development.

Table 3

Doctoral Degree Requirements

Requirements	Number of Institutions Reporting Requirement
Minimum of 90 Semester or 120 Quarter Hour Credits	11
Thesis Required	18
College Teaching Practicum	9
Two Year Full Time Residency	2
One Year Full Time Residency	11
Non-education courses	3
Major of 33 Semester or 50 Quarter Hours	7
Statistics	15
Language*	6
Research	11

*Ph.D. only

Another open-ended question on traditional, but not required, departmental obligations of doctoral students resulted in no consensus. Supervision of instruction, teaching, doctoral seminars, assistantship, participation in professional organizations, field course teaching, and clinical work all were mentioned once.

Of the eighteen institutions reporting, all but five indicated that either the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree could be awarded. Of the remaining programs three offered the Ph.D. only while two had only the Ed.D. available.

In response to an open-ended question on the difference between the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree requirements, high agreement was indicated. Five of the seven programs responding to that item required greater research orientation for Ph.D. candidates. Three programs indicated the requirement of a minor in the Ph.D. program. Only two of the respondents indicated a foreign language requirement, and then only for Ph.D. candidates.

When asked to indicate number of students who had, to date, failed to complete the doctoral program, only seven programs noted any failures. The range for the seven programs reporting failures was two to ten with all but one listing less than ten and all but two indicating five or less.

SUMMARY

Doctoral students presently enrolled in reading programs more than equal the number who have received the doctorate in that field to date from the eighteen institutions contributing data to this survey. Thus, June graduation could provide a large influx of newly trained professionals which could drastically change what has been a rather pleasant placement picture.

The typical doctoral student is more likely to be married (66%) than single (27%) or divorced (7%). Slightly more than half are Female (58%).

The overwhelming majority of current doctoral students in reading come from a traditional background of elementary, public school experience. Secondary school teachers constitute the next, (though considerably smaller), share, with private/parochial schools, and tutorial/clinical programs contributing an almost negligible share.

Admission requirements tend to be rather uniform, though eclectic in composition. Graduate grade averages and recommendations, closely followed by an interview, are the most frequently reported means for assessing students for doctoral program admission.

Degree requirements are the most difficult aspect upon which

to generalize. All reporting programs had a thesis requirement and most (fifteen) required statistics as a research tool. Other frequently cited requirements included 90 semester or 120 quarter hour credits, one year full-time residency, and research competency.

Nearly half of the institutions required some course work in social, philosophical, and cultural foundations of education. Only one program listed a specific requirement for courses to be taken outside the college of education.

Non-course requirements and traditional, but non-required, departmental obligations received no consensus among the reporting institutions.

Thirteen of the eighteen reporting institutions offer both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree with emphasis in reading. The major difference in the programs appears to be in the greater emphasis on research skills for Ph.D. students.

Evaluation of Doctoral Training Experiences by the ☐ A. Victims; ☐ B. Victors (Choose One)

Jack L. Burtch
Slippery Rock State College

George Canney
University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign

Gretchen Crafts
San Diego State University

Patricia Cunningham
Ohio University

Larry D. Ditto
University of Toledo

Lance M. Gentile
Pan American University

Walter J. Lamberg
University of Texas at Austin

Linda Leonard Lamme
University of Florida

Etta Miller
Texas Christian University

Jerome A. Niles
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Robert J. Tierney
University of Arizona

Joseph L. Vaughan, Jr.
University of Arizona

In an age when consumerism is a popular sport it seems logical to evaluate the services of doctoral training programs through the eyes of those served. To this end EPISTLE contacted new graduates from several doctoral programs and requested brief responses to the following question:

> EPISTLE is interested in the views of recent graduates regarding doctoral program requirements and learning experiences. As a 1974 graduate of a doctoral program in Reading, would you share your insight? We wish to know what learning experiences you felt were most helpful, least helpful, over-emphasized, and under-emphasized. Did your learning experiences prepare you for

your job? Please outline what you as a student felt were the major requirements of your doctoral program and evaluate them as to relevancy both as a graduate student and now as a graduate. What changes would you recommend to improve the training of doctoral candidates?

A dozen responses to that request are printed below. Individual responses are randomly ordered in order to avoid connection of critiques with specific doctoral programs. Hopefully, by protecting the identity of both the guilty and the innocent we will retain a climate of open communication in which the changes advised can be attempted.

RESPONSES

The major aspects of my experience as a doctoral student included taking various courses, conducting small-scale research projects, testing and tutoring problem readers in a clinic setting, writing a qualifying examination, and meeting the requirements for a doctoral dissertation. In addition to these activities, my program included a practicum requirement which gave me the opportunity to spend a large part of my time serving a selected group of elementary teachers in an advisory capacity.

I value all of the experiences my program provided. As a result of these experiences, I think it is safe to say that I now have a good grasp of the "content" of reading, a knowledge of the relevant research, the skills necessary for reading and conducting research, and an understanding and appreciation of the problems which face teachers as they try to produce effective readers.

In my present capacity as a trainer of teachers of reading, however, I find that merely "knowing my stuff," as it were, does not necessarily ensure quality in my role as a preservice teacher trainer. At this point I have some regret that my doctoral program did not include some provision for the development of competencies in the various aspects of teacher-training techniques and programs. It would seem essential that good doctoral programs for teacher trainers include opportunities for college-level teaching experiences, as well as some forum for the discussion of new and effective innovations in teacher training programs. It cannot be assumed, I feel, that public school experience is sufficient training for college-level teaching.

* * * * * *

In addressing myself to an evaluation of my doctoral ex-

periences, I have attempted to discuss a few selected, separate experiences and relate these to the total program. In this respect, it is my contention that an adequate doctoral program requires not only the structure to ensure the development of the various capabilities of their students, but also the flexibility and tone to facilitate their preparation.

Many valuable doctoral experiences fell outside the realm of what could be labelled "degree requirements." Typically, such experiences had the common feature of practicality and included experiences ranging from classroom practice to reading research. In the area of classroom practice, faculty sponsored opportunities were afforded by which competency could be attained either setting up reading programs, evaluating reading programs, or implementing workshops. Similar experiences were fostered at the university level via graduate assistantships. Without doubt, the benefits associated with these opportunities arose largely from the willingness of both faculty and peers to share ideas and encourage self-improvement. Having personally accrued many benefits from such experiences, it seems regrettable that similar opportunities are outside the precinct of most doctoral requirements. Obviously, via incorporation of an apprenticeship model, a variety of professional experiences could be sequenced and implemented to facilitate other doctoral candidates' preparation and development in these areas.

In the area of research, an apprenticeship experience was available in the form of an internship. This internship entailed gradual immersion in various research projects, relatively free access to computer facilities, various seminars with competent researchers, participation in discussions centered around the research problems of faculty and doctoral students, and opportunities by which one's personal research interests could be developed. From a personal viewpoint, the experiences aided in extending the knowledge accumulated in research courses, as well as removing some of the unnecessary reservations towards research implementation.

Limitations to the learning experiences, while rare, did exist. For example, excluded from the written preliminary examinations was any type of visible, direct assessment of the student's ability to work within classrooms or research settings. Also, inhibitions served to limit the interchange of ideas between doctoral students across institutions and between doctoral students across committees. A possible solution to the latter problem might be organization of retreats which facilitate communication between separated parties.

* * * * * *

Doctoral programs in Reading have had two purposes: to train clinicians or supervisors and to train researchers in

the field. A reading department may emphasize one of these more than the other. When the strength of a department is congruent with the goals of the student, learning experiences are maximized. However, when there is conflict, learning experiences are disappointing.

The department in which I worked provided varied experiences for those wishing to become clinicians or supervisors. The working relationship with a child-study center was particularly rewarding.

Because few faculty members were interested in conducting experimental research, the opportunity to work with an experienced researcher in the field was meager. Although I felt that this was a weakness of the department, many of the other graduate students did not seem to mind nor to want a different program.

The complaints most often expressed by students were not unique to a reading department. One criticism was the difficulty in completing the dissertation. Perhaps providing earlier opportunities to conduct and report research would make dissertation writing easier. A second complaint was that certain courses were taught at too elementary a level and did not reflect research.

Some of the most exciting learning experiences were discussions about newer theories of reading. More emphasis on this type of information and less emphasis on working within public schools would have strengthened the doctoral program.

The most helpful experience was the opportunity to teach a section of a graduate course in reading. I feel that this experience had the most direct bearing on determining my career goals and actually getting a faculty position.

Because we were a small department, close relationships were built among graduate students and between faculty members. This made the school more enjoyable.

* * * * * *

I would like to begin by expressing the dubious reaction I feel in having become an "expert" in this field. The truth of the matter is that I find myself stumped, on numerous occasions, in attempting to answer many of the questions asked of me by students and teachers. However, I cannot view this as a reflection on my preparation in the doctoral program, but rather an indication of the highly complex and multi-dimensional aspect of the reading process itself. In many instances there are just no ready answers available.

Indeed, I was quite fortunate to have been graduated from a very comprehensive program. For three years I was employed

as a Graduate Teaching Associate. Nevertheless, I found that course work was, very often, totally impractical. The Reading courses were helpful in laying the groundwork for my teaching responsibilities; however, the courses from the rest of the School of Education were meaningless. Most of the expertise that I earned came from the need to prepare myself for the difficult task of teaching not only undergraduate courses in Reading, but graduate courses as well. I also served as the Bilingual Reading Consultant to teachers of migrant students in the school districts throughout the state. These experiences afforded the valuable opportunity of applying the principles and practices of theoretical reading instruction from the classroom to real-life situations.

The courses for which I was responsible during the three years ranged from undergraduate and graduate courses in the Foundations of Elementary and Secondary Reading to Reading Improvement for University Students and Adults, Diagnostic and Prescriptive Techniques, Clinic (whereby the Graduate Teaching Associate was not only responsible for tutoring students with specific reading disabilities, but served thereafter as a supervisor of teachers and other university students in their role as tutors in this course), Reading for the Culturally Different Student, and Special Programs in Reading. I also had the luxury of working directly with numerous youngsters from several junior high schools and assisted them in developmental and corrective reading instruction. Last spring I was contracted by the Veteran's Affairs Office on campus to teach three courses of reading to veterans in their Upward Bound Program.

The Director of the Reading Center acted as my mentor and chaired my doctoral committee. He very eagerly directed my course of study, and his years of experience were invaluable in the steering of my dissertation. He is in many ways a remarkable man. I found him to be a unique and capable administrator. He allowed me all the necessary freedom yet provided the indispensable supervision that helped promote and fulfill this educational experience. With his guidance I feel I was able to make the most difficult of transitions; i.e., moving from an externally or "other-directed" person, to an intrinsically or "self-directed" one. I will always be influenced by my major professor's manner and approach to education, and to life itself.

In these times it is fashionable to mount barrages of criticism against higher education, particularly doctoral study. It is appropriate for me, therefore, to say that in no way am I in accord with these voices of protest. My life, for one, has been dramatically influenced and profoundly altered by the doctoral program in reading which I completed.

* * * * * *

Evaluating the content of one's doctoral program should be a simple task as I think back on the numerous complaints I registered during my tenure as a doctoral student. However, having recently begun my initiation in looking at the complex problem of offering a quality doctoral program from the University's posture, it becomes a much more difficult task. After assuming the responsibilities of a college professor, one rapidly begins to realize what some of the rationales were underlying many of the issues over which he had so earnestly protested as a student.

Without question, the two most valuable learning experiences in my program were the opportunity for me to teach college level courses and the development of my dissertation. Teaching the courses afforded me the chance to organize and present much of the content which I had been assimilating over the course of the program. The teaching assignment enabled me to make some tentative decisions concerning my career with respect to college teaching. Also the experience gained from teaching the courses helped to instill at least a modicum of confidence needed in facing that first college teaching position.

The primary objective of the dissertation in my program was to examine the individual's ability to produce scholarly independent research. I found the dissertation process favorably designed to accomplish this purpose. The emphasis always remained student centered with the faculty committee serving as a helpful resource. The pre-proposal, proposal, and final defense stages were evaluative in nature but always in a constructive sense.

In looking at the least helpful aspects of the program I would single out the comprehensive examinations as being superfluous. My program required two; the major comprehensive in reading and a minor one in educational psychology. I found that these exams required an inordinate amount of energy investment which could have been devoted to more productive projects. Since the exams were designed to test course content, it seems they were redundant in their purpose if appropriate evaluation procedures were used when initially taking the courses.

Specific to my program, an exposure to more research oriented content earlier in the course sequence would have been desirable. In conjunction with the increased emphasis on research would be the requirement of doing several smaller research projects perhaps as a relevant replacement for the comprehensive exams. As an extension of the college teaching responsibilities of the doctoral student, his participation in or observation of at least some parts of the process of departmental functioning would prove helpful. The insights which one could gain into the internal workings of higher education would be of invaluable assistance when encountering that first teaching position. Finally, based on the assumption that doctoral students usually represent a population with a wide variety of interests and curiosities, I feel a graduate seminar primarily designed and implemented by the students would produce a most satisfying result.

Presently my response to the question concerning the relevance of my preparation for my present position is in general quite positive. However, my unequivocal response will not be available until June '75.

* * * * * *

The doctoral program I completed was well-designed, yet flexible enough to permit pursuance of special interests.

The strengths of the program included a diversity of opinions and interests among the four reading faculty, program continuity, and a stress on a broad selection of courses outside elementary education -- psychology, educational psychology, secondary education, child development, special education.

Each doctoral candidate was expected to take at least nine credits of statistics, and additional courses in research design and computer programming were available.

As part of my training, I was assigned to a professor who functioned as an advisor and for whom I worked as a TA for two years. During that period, I assisted in three different reading courses, taught an undergraduate reading methods course, and did some consulting work in a local school system.

Perhaps one of the most valuable experiences was the half-time assignment, arranged by my advisor, as a reading resource teacher in a local school. In that capacity I helped conceptualize and develop a reading center, taught groups of children, worked with teachers in an inservice capacity, and developed new curriculum.

The diversity of experiences in the doctoral program, coupled with previously earned B.A. and M.A. degrees in psychology, an M.Ed. in education, and several years of elementary classroom teaching experience all contributed toward my being offered my present position and my confidence that I am prepared to further both the research and the effectiveness of teacher training programs.

Although time constraints were a major factor, I would offer the suggestion that in the future graduate students be encouraged to take an independent study course which results in at least one study which can be published prior to program completion.

Overall, I would have to rate my training as strong, well-balanced, and reasonably complete for the time spent. The satisfaction I feel at this time certainly should in part be credited to my advisor and the support and push he provided.

Requirements for my Ph.D. in Education with a specialization in reading included a completed Master's degree or equivalent, two years full-time paid experience in the appropriate area of specialization, a major and two minor fields of specialization, competency in statistics and a foreign language, approximately 135 hours of coursework in reading and related areas, and a dissertation involving research or development and testing of a research tool or methodology. These requirements were somewhat flexible and tailored to the candidate's needs and background -- one of the plusses of the program.

Another plus is preliminary and final comprehensive exams tailored to the individual candidate's areas of study and background. Preliminary exams are both written (8 hours) and oral (2 hours) and include areas in which the candidate is expected to be competent as a result of coursework and experience. The final exam is over the candidate's research and lasts approximately two hours. It is oral. These exams are generally fair, though two criticisms might be leveled against them: (1)writing an examination for eight hours in a single day may turn out to be a test of physical endurance rather than knowledge and (2) pre-exam anxiety raised in the student by the department is inordinately high.

Generally, the program in reading is relevant to elementary and secondary teachers or trainers of the same. As with most graduate programs in reading, however, relevancy to teachers of college reading or trainers of college reading teachers is marginal. With growing numbers of developmental and remedial reading programs in community colleges and universities, a strong program in college reading is, without a doubt, one of the greatest needs not yet met by graduate schools.

Several needed improvements have been noted above -- the most important of which is a stronger college reading program. One serious problem with the reading program I completed generally relates to the small size of the department.

Departmental size limits the candidate considerably in selection of a major professor and selection of courses. Only three possible choices for major professor were available when I entered the program in 1972, one of whom has since died and, to my knowledge, has not yet been replaced. Although enough excellent courses are offered that the student ultimately achieves a good grounding in reading theory and practice, as in most universities, courses range from those that dwell on petty detail to the point of inanity to those that are so loosely structured in content as to have little to offer. The small size of the department tends to spotlight these faults beyond usual proportions and, at the same time, forces students to endure such classes because of lack of choice.

Finally, a most important needed change (and one which I understand is under development) is to provide students and

faculty with written school and departmental guidelines that explicitly delineate regulations, deadlines, student rights and recourses, and the like, for doctoral candidates. With only loosely understood guidelines, the candidate often finds himself missing an important deadline or overlooking a regulation and, not knowing his rights and recourses, at the mercy of his committee, major professor, or the graduate dean --some of whom may know as little about these matters as the student himself.

In short, the program has some positive areas -- namely, flexibility, relevancy to elementary and secondary reading specialists, and good basic grounding in reading theory and practice --but negative areas as well --namely, marginal relevancy to college reading specialists, lack of delineated guidelines for candidates, and several problems relating to department size.

* * * * * *

For the past two years I have learned what reading might be, what it might not be, and that no one else is "quite sure" either. I now have a doctorate in reading, so I'm a reading "expert." WOW! Is that what a doctorate has done to me? I wonder why I don't feel like an expert.

One of the components of my program was twenty-four hours of course work. Such minimal course requirements may appear to be a limitation, but, in reality, it allowed me the flexibility to design a program to meet my needs. The extensiveness of each course was such that it provided a terra firma in content and demanded a high quality of thought. Exactly half of the course requirements was in diagnostic and remediation practice, allowing me to learn by doing. The high calibre of awareness and thought exhibited in these classes served as a model and a stimulant for me to produce the best work I could. To have done less would have let my professors and myself down. This component of my degree program provided me with an awareness of the complexities of reading, extensive practice in diagnosing and remediating real cases, and an internal drive to examine critically both my ideas and those of others.

The most important component of my program occurred while assisting in the practica, teaching courses in extension, and consulting in a local Title I project. It has been said that there is no teacher like experience. AMEN! Had I been tied to additional course requirements and not been able to spend a year directing clinic operations, teaching graduate courses, and floundering with primary teachers in live classrooms, I probably would think that I am an expert. Because I did have those experiences, I know that I am not.

The essence of the philosophy expressed in my doctoral department is that teaching reading successfully is accomplished

by identifying the needs of a student and designing an instructional program to meet those needs directly. It is a tribute to the professors in my training program that they practice what they teach.

To me a doctorate is a license to learn, not to preach. A doctoral program should thus produce learners, not knowers. If learners are to be developed, a doctoral program must be demanding and flexible where the responsibility for success lies with the student. Anything less may reflect a fear of those who design it -- a fear that their graduates will not be "experts." In my program I was afforded the guidance, the freedom, and the opportunity to learn. Because of that, I will continue to learn. Will I ever become an expert? God forbid!

* * * * * *

My doctoral program required 90 semester hours of work, of which 18 were for the dissertation for a Ph.D. (An Ed.D. was 15, I believe.). This was beyond the masters' level. There were three examinations required in this program, a 45-hour exam, taken after the completion of 15 hours (45 beyond the bachelors' degree), a qualifying examination, taken after the completion of all coursework, and an oral examination on the dissertation. The 45-hour exam for me was a two-week take-home paper on a topic of interest, which in my case was related to a proposed dissertation topic. The student submitted 6 topics to the faculty which then picked one for the student to write on, the idea being that this examination would test a student's ability to write well, to predict one's qualifications for beginning a program which included a dissertation. The qualifying examination in my case had just changed from a written examination to an oral defense of the dissertation proposal taken in front of the faculty of the department. In my view, each of these exams was helpful to me as a student as well as giving the faculty a pretty good idea of my competence as a writer and a potential researcher. My ability in subject fields could be assessed by my grades in those courses.

The courses included in my doctoral program were pretty flexible, allowing for variation in interests among students in the program. I had to take two statistics courses and at least one research course. The statistics courses were offered by the Educational Psychology Department and were not very relevant to my needs. I really learned the little I know of statistics from my advisors and other faculty members who helped me with the statistics involved with my dissertation study. The other courses which I took were very challenging and interesting. The instructors were flexible in their course requirements, allowing me to pursue independent study topics when that seemed the best avenue of approach. I was teaching full time on the faculty of education while completing my

doctoral work, so I greatly appreciated the opportunity to integrate my doctoral study and my teaching. This was the highlight of my experience combining graduate study with college-level teaching.

Overall I feel that the doctoral program prepared me well for my present position. More important, I enjoyed my course-work while I was in the program. I feel as though I got to know the faculty well, for they treated me as an individual. I would have enjoyed a relevant statistics course taught by someone in the reading and language arts center in conjunction with one of the several research courses which I took in that department. I would have enjoyed an ongoing faculty-graduate student seminar where research was discussed.

It seems to me that the key elements which make a doctoral program both enjoyable and effective include flexibility of course requirements, good teaching in graduate courses, relevant examination requirements, and an atmosphere of colleagueship among doctoral students and faculty. My doctoral program included all of these elements and therefore, I was most satisfied with it.

* * * * * *

As a doctoral student, the most helpful experience I had was not actually a requirement of the doctoral program. It was the opportunity for a two-year, part-time appointment on the staff of the university's Reading and Learning Skills Center. I do not mean to suggest that the course work and research for the dissertation were not valuable; however, I am certain their value was increased by the chance to apply what I was learning in the courses and to apply the principles I was investigating in my research to the work at the Center.

A major responsibility of the Reading and Learning Skills Center is to provide reading and study-skills classes and academic tutoring and counseling to university students. Clients range from students with skill-deficits (including foreign students with little preparation in English) to highly successful students in graduate and professional schools who simply want to increase their efficiency in reading and studying. A second responsibility of the Center is to present, with the School of Education, a graduate course in reading (a practicum in diagnosis and treatment). In conjunction with this course, the Center operates a clinic. Elementary and secondary students are referred by local schools to the clinic; they receive diagnosis and treatment from student-teachers enrolled in the graduate course. Staff members serve as supervisors.

Staff members may work in both the College and Clinic

Programs. They may also assist the Director of the Center in the design of the college courses, the presentation of the practicum, and in the development and validation of instructional materials for both programs. Finally, they occasionally serve as consultants to faculty and students at the university and public school teachers.

* * * * * *

It is difficult to isolate and assess the utility of the various elements of my doctoral program; however, I was generally satisfied with the program's requirements and the resulting learning experiences. The program offered opportunities to study with knowledgeable individuals, an opportunity to conduct a study, and opportunities to teach. The requirements of the program seemed relevant and well-planned.

The most helpful experiences were directly related to the department in which I worked. Fortunately, I chose an institution with a reading-language arts department large enough to offer a wide range of experience. The departmental offerings were generally eclectic, since most of the professors seemed dedicated to specific philosophical positions. Their positions varied; thus my knowledge and understanding of reading has what I believe to be a healthy degree of breadth.

I was fortunate enough to teach rather extensively during my program. I valued the experiences and learned a great deal in the classroom. However, in retrospect, I wonder if the time I devoted to teaching was at the expense of other potentially valuable experiences. Perhaps my teaching experiences were over-emphasized.

Probably the least emphasized experiences were ones which would help me close the gap between my college classroom and teachers in the field. Little opportunity was available within my program for directed experiences which would be of help in articulating my reading knowledge into practical reading instruction for children. As a prospective teacher educator I could have benefited from directed field experiences with children and teachers in their classrooms.

I have questioned whether I am prepared for my present position. I generally feel I am probably as prepared as any other neophyte who has just entered into a new classroom experience. I feel somewhat knowledgeable about my subject; I feel confident in my ability to work with my students; I am enthusiastic about reading; and I am optimistic about my future role in reading instruction. I honestly believe my program provided me with a solid foundation for future growth thus fulfilling its purpose.

'Twas the year after graduation
and far from the fold
She looked back with fondness
to grad days of old.

With special affection
she remembered the nights
When with three of her cohorts
she plotted for equal rights.

What transpired during seminar
is neither there nor here.
The real event took place later
over pizza and beer.

The transcript lists the courses
each with an impressive title.
The content of most, unfortunately,
was somewhat less than vital!

On many occasions, they pondered
her "fellow" students and she
What remains to this day
an unsolved mystery.

What is it in the word "class"
that takes a learned man
And transforms him into someone
who does less than he can?

The transcript lists the courses
and their corresponding grades
But makes absolutely no mention
of the real learning aids:

Being a teaching assistant
to a learned mentor,
Gave them a simulation
of what they were headed for.

And when with their own class
they were finally bestowed,
They stretched their minds and talents
and "They growed!"

But the best fun of all
came with two days warning.
"Be ready. I'll pick you up
at six Tuesday morning!"

And off they would travel
with Doctor X as their guide
To serve as consultants
to the "real world" outside.

MEMBERSHIP in the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association is open to IRA members working, qualified to work, or planning to work in programs for training individuals to work in graduate training programs in reading (in most cases, doctoral programs). Members gather annually for a pre-convention meeting at each IRA convention. Dues include a one-year subscription to EPISTLE, the organization's quarterly publication forum.

Renew or Begin Your Membership Now,
Share the Extra Blank with a Colleague.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Institution _____

☐ New Membership

☐ Renewal

Note: As long as supplies last new members will receive a copy of EPISTLE Vol. 2, No. 1 upon payment of dues.

Present Status:

☐ Doctoral Program Professor

☐ Graduate Program Professor

☐ Undergraduate Program Professor

☐ Graduate Student

☐ Public School Training Specialist

☐ Other _____

send the completed application blank with $6.00 to:

Dr. Warren Wheelock
Secretary/Treasurer, PRTE
University of Missouri - Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

They were "learning the business"
at the elbow of "the teach"
Who showed he could practice
as well as he could preach.

Now out in the real world
she felt quite able
To teach and do workshops
and counsel Miss Mabel.

If that were all there were to it,
all would be swell
But there are other areas
she didn't learn as well.

Along with the others
through "Sadistics" she muddled
Now trying to do research
she is constantly befuddled.

"I can compute an anova
and table a "t"
what it all means
is a mystery to me."

And while on the subject
of things she can't
Would someone please help her
write this government grant!

While their doctoral program
had many facets,
The people they met there
are its biggest assets.

The professors respond
to weekly WATS calls.
With care packages sent to
their less-endowed halls.

And across this country
stretching from end to end
Is a network of ex-grad students
she calls "friend."

* * * * * *

Some Criteria for Evaluating Reading Doctoral Programs

Richard Allington
State University of New York at Albany

In previous issues of the EPISTLE, several authors have dealt with examining various aspects of doctoral programs in reading. Much of the information presented has been descriptive in nature and as such offers a basis for comparing existing programs with the norm. For graduate students interested in selecting a doctoral program, however, the efforts of the various authors provide few firm guidelines. So too for faculty interested in improving the quality of existing programs.

The following ten questions are intended to provide members of both populations with general guidelines for selecting or strengthening a doctoral program. The questions are written more to the graduate student since they are the purpose for any doctoral program. The answers will be basically subjective but should permit comparisons between existing programs and the "ideal" program.

1. Does the program have a creditable reputation for producing graduates in your interest area?

Too often a doctoral program is selected for convenience rather than on a more sound reasoning base. Regionalism is not necessarily bad, but it can lead to stifling conformity. Examine the credentials of institutions as carefully as the institution examines the credentials of prospective students. Ask to examine copies of dissertations produced by previous students. Evaluate the publications generated by the faculty. If your interest area is not represented in either category, pursue the topic with various faculty. Ask the hard questions.

2. Does the faculty enhance the program?

From the students' point of view, the faculty is the heart of a doctoral program. Nationally recognized faculty provide one type of enhancing effect. However, if this national recognition means rare contacts with students beyond scheduled class times, it may not enhance the training aspect of the program. There are also faculty who have not gained national recognition, but who nevertheless carry the load. It may be that they provide better training than prominent figures. Check with current or former students to establish the value of the various personnel.

3. Does the program offer coursework of sufficient breadth and depth?

Examine the available curricular offerings. Is there coursework that is unique to your interest area? Does the program have

sufficient course offerings above the Master's level? Are there courses in current research in reading, reading theory, psycholinguistics, advanced diagnosis of reading disability, etc.? If independent study is the more common mode of advanced instruction, explore both the rationale and the intensity of directed assistance. Programs which offer a basic duplication of previous coursework should be questioned. Another area to explore is whether the institution mandates minimum class size. If so, is the limit reasonable in comparison to the number of students available for enrollment? Courses on the books but never offered because fewer than the minimum number of students are available add nothing. The courses designed for advanced graduate students need not be extensive, but a doctoral program should be able to provide students an interesting array of scheduled offerings.

4. Does the program offer flexibility for meeting a variety of professional aspirations and interests?

Flexibility is a hallmark of good doctoral programs. At this stage of professional preparation the student must necessarily have some control over his destiny. Programs which have the same course of study requirements for all students can offer only limited preparation. Public school personnel, state education personnel, teacher training faculty, educational researchers, etc., require specialized training for each role. A doctoral program which fails to offer flexibility in preparation at these broad levels will probably not be able to offer the needed flexibility of program design within these areas. Check out the options for a course of study but also remember that too much flexibility may indicate poor organization. Flexibility within a general structure is probably the best design available.

5. Does the program offer the opportunity to develop personal and professional relationships with faculty and fellow students?

It has been said that the most valuable segment of a doctoral program is that which takes place outside the classroom in offices, faculty lounges, and lunch rooms. Working with faculty is tremendously more fulfilling than just working for faculty. Interview students enrolled in the program. Is the program one that offers or encourages faculty-student relationships nearer a peer level than a master-slave system? If the program is basically similar to the impersonal undergraduate model, you would be well advised to evaluate other programs. Learning is an interaction between people and personal interaction fosters learning like no seminar can.

Also examine the relationship of various students to each other. It doesn't have to be one big happy family, but it is a positive virtue if they do more than attend a few classes together. Doctoral programs are generally rigorous, and, beyond

the learning that can be fostered through interaction with other students, there is the occasional need to get one's head together. Others in the same boat, up the same creek, can often ease the mind.

6. Does the program provide opportunities for internships in the career role you have chosen?

One of the most neglected phases in the training of teacher trainers has been in the area of classroom performance. Doctoral programs in reading generally offer coursework on the reading process and experience in the areas of diagnosis and remediation of reading disability, but few offer training on how to teach teachers. If you are to teach an undergraduate section or to conduct inservice training sessions, find out if the program offers opportunities for evaluation of and subsequent improvement in these processes. Are you to be thrown in, to sink or swim? Or are there opportunities to explore a variety of instructional techniques, always working toward refinement?

Ask similar questions of the other roles, should you have chosen one. What will the program do to make you more effective in your career role?

7. Does the program provide for financial benefits beyond the fellowship support?

Given the paltry sum that most fellowships or assistantships provide, it is wise to evaluate whether other sources of support are available. Are graduate students allowed to earn extra monies through activities such as workshops, inservice training sessions, diagnostic workshops, consulting work, substitute teaching, or tutoring? If so, are these activities encouraged and fostered by faculty? Each of the aforementioned activities provides a type of on-the-job training and contact with the world outside the ivory tower. Given the nature of most doctoral programs, full-time students will have only limited time available, but an extra hundred dollars a month can help stave off malnutrition. Carefully examine this area unless you have a handsome nestegg--the traditional $3000.00 (plus or minus $200.00) allottment puts far less bread on the table now than it did in 1960.

8. Does the program offer a clearly delineated fellowship assignment?

Fellowship work requirements vary in terms of hours commitment. They also vary in terms of actual assignment. Some fellows end up as typists, fileclerks, or receptionists. Others are utilized as teaching fellows (but see 5 and 6 above) or research assistants. Some research assistants get their paycheck and library assignments, others get footnoted or acknowledged,

and still others get co-authorships. All of these variables are functions of institutional tradition, program design, and faculty whim. Before accepting a fellowship find out if it's funded in heaven or hell, or somewhere in between.

9. Does the program evidence cooperation with local education authorities?

The ivory tower is still alive and well and residing in various locations. Cooperative efforts with local education authorities are often service functions but could and should have greater depth. These contacts with the daily realities of students in classrooms can strengthen the program through, for example, increased input, experience opportunities, and research. The isle of knowledge in the sea of ignorance model should have gone out with the turn of the century. Beware, it yet lives.

10. Does the program offer opportunities to participate in professional organizations and meetings?

Support varies considerably among doctoral programs. Some programs have faculty who hold hierarchical positions in professional organizations. This generally ensures involvement whether one desires it or not. Some institutions provide doctoral students with monies to attend professional meetings. Some do not provide money to attend professional meetings. Some do not provide money for either doctoral students or faculty. Some programs have departmental slush funds created from diagnostic fees, inservice fees, or royalties from task force type publications. Research papers, program participation, or simple attendance at state and national reading conferences can be valuable professional experiences. Find out the details and work for the development of increased opportunities in this area.

SUMMARY

No program can be everything to everyone. Each can, however, provide unique opportunities and experiences. The intended purpose of this brief paper was to offer guidelines for evaluating doctoral programs in reading, guidelines for both prospective doctoral students and faculty interested in improving the quality of training provided their clients. Because of brevity many questions remained unasked. Thus, the questions posed should be considered only a starting point in an evaluation process.

And How Does Your Program Rate?

Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

No doubt one's evaluation of doctoral programs in reading depends largely upon one's personal student and/or professional affiliation. Programs might be ranked differently, given either varied rating criteria or different areas of interest. Nevertheless, both students and professors still ask the question, "What program is the best?"

As a final series of items on the doctoral program evaluation survey conducted by Palmatier and Manzo, respondents were asked to rate themselves and other programs. Each institution was first asked to rank its own program in one of three categories: top five (Group A), second five (Group B), and lower (Group C). Next, each respondent was requested to list what he felt were nationally the first five and second five doctoral programs in reading. Another question asked institutions to report on efforts at self-evaluation.

SELF RATING

Fourteen institutions responded to the item on the ranking of their program into the three category grouping. Eight (57%) equated their programs with the top five. Four (29%) matched their programs with the second five. Only two (14%) institutions reported a lower self rating. If self concept affects program strength, at least twelve of the respondents appear to be in good condition.

In addition to the subjective equating of programs with other institutions, respondents were asked to report on student program evaluation techniques used. None of the programs reported that a formal student evaluation had been conducted. One institution noted that individual courses were evaluated by students. Another respondent indicated that an informal evaluation was completed annually in the doctoral seminar.

PEER EVALUATION

Eleven of the eighteen institutions did not respond to the peer-ranking question. Table 1 shows the results of the nine reporting institutions that undertook this task. The number of times an institution was mentioned in either group is given for all programs receiving more than a single mention. Be-

sides the fourteen universities included in Table 1, twenty-two other institutions received a single mention; eight of these mentions were for Group A and fourteen for Group B.

As indicated by data in Table 1, only five programs received more than a single vote for Group A. Designation of Group B placement was more widely spread but only nine institutions received more than a single mention. Combining totals for Group A and Group B does not change the order from that determined using only designations for Group A. The very limited sample restricts interpretation of the data but does provide some gauge of subjective evaluation among doctoral program respondents.

Table 1

Institutions Receiving More Than One Mention in Ranking of Top Ten Doctoral Training Programs by Raters from Nine Doctoral Institutions

Institutions	Group A: Number of Mentions in First Five	Group B: Number of Mentions in Second Five	Total of First and Second Mentions
Syracuse University	8	2	10
Arizona State University - Tempe	7	3	10
Indiana University	6	2	8
University of Georgia	5	1	6
University of Wisconsin	2	4	6
University of Minnesota	1	3	4
Boston University	1	3	4
University of Chicago	1	2	3
University of California - Berkeley	0	3	3
University of Delaware	1	1	2
Florida State University	1	1	2
University of Southern Mississippi	1	1	2
Wayne State University	1	1	2
University of Pittsburgh	1	1	2

DISCUSSION

For those fourteen institutions listed some measure of national ranking by peers has been given. Since the basis for ranking was not asked of respondents, no answer can be drawn from the meager data given. One message, however, is clear. If this information proves to be of interest to potential graduate students, job hunting graduates, and budget-defending department heads, the need for a more expansive and definitive survey is indicated.

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities

Need a change for a semester or quarter? Have a doctoral student who desires a work experience not available in your program? Curious about how your doctoral students compare with those from other universities? Or maybe you would like a trial period in a different climate area. Any of these desires are sufficient reason for contacting PRTE's Exchange Clearinghouse for faculty and graduate students.

The Clearinghouse functions as a collector and disseminator of information concerning persons who wish to exchange positions with their peers. In future issues information about individuals wishing to make temporary exchanges will be published. Contacts between those interested in exchanges will then be up to the individuals involved. Neither the EPISTLE, PRTE, nor the Clearinghouse at Arizona State can be responsible for making final agreements between parties wishing to undertake an exchange. We can tell you where the ballparks are but must leave arranging and playing the game up to you.

If you are interested in an exchange contact:

Dr. Ernest Dishner
Reading Center
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

A form for putting your name into the Clearinghouse pool is printed here for your convenience. Others are available from Dr. Dishner. When your form is received you will be sent an up-to-date listing of other "exchangers." Your information will, if you desire, also be printed in the next issue of the EPISTLE.

STUDENT AND FACULTY EXCHANGE FORM

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators - International Reading Association

NAME: _____ (Last), _____ (First) _____ (Middle)

POSITION: _____ (Title), _____ (Institution)

SPECIALIZATION: _____

	Office	Home
ADDRESS:		
PHONE:		

	Institution	Degree	Date
EDUCATION:			

	Title	Location	Dates
PRIOR WORK:			

	Type of Position You Wish	Duties Required of Your Replacement
EXCHANGE:		

WHEN: _____ (Year) _____ (Quarter or Semester Exchange Desired)

OTHER COMMENTS: _____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

MOVERS: A Chronicle of Professional Relocations

This regular feature endeavors to keep up with the placement of new graduates and moves by veterans in reading education. Names and new professional locations, and institution left should be sent to Bob Palmatier , 309 Aderhold Building, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602

NEW GRADS

. . . from Indiana University

Martha Evans, Assistant Professor
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

. . . from Ball State University

Peggy Jelks, Assistant Professor
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

. . . from University of Michigan

Walter Lamberg, Assistant Professor
University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas

. . . from University of Minnesota

George F. Canney, Assistant Professor
University of Illinois, Champaign - Urbana, Illinois

. . . from University of Northern Colorado

Robert Pavliic, Assistant Professor
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado

Larry Ditto, Assistant Professor
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

. . . from University of Arizona

Elisabeth A. Dagdigian, Instructor
University of Arizona, Tuscon, Arizona

. . . from University of Virginia

Joseph L. Vaughan, Assistant Professor
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

. . . from Oregon State University

Gretchen Crafts, Assistant Professor
San Diego State University, San Diego, California

. . . from University of Georgia

Ann Marie Franzen
Oakland Intermediate School District, Pontiac, Michigan

Monica Jean Hiler, Associate Professor
Gainesville Junior College, Gainesville, Georgia

Kay Marshman, Assistant Professor
Madonna College, Livonia, Michigan

Joan Schelly, Temporary Assistant Professor
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

VETERAN RELOCATIONS

William R. Powell, Professor
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Katie Hanson, Instructor
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California

Jerry D. King, Associate Professor
Redlands University, Redlands, California

Joseph Peterson, Associate Professor
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota

Larry Harris, Professor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

John T. Holmes, Assistant Professor
Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

Hal Seaton, Assistant Professor
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

L. G. Butler, Assistant Professor
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas

Gary D. Spray, Assistant Professor
California State University, Sacramento, California

Donald Lashinger
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

Judith Meagher, Associate Professor
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

Barbara Palmer, Assistant Professor
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

M. W. Harp, Assistant Professor
Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon

JOB REPORT

The following positions have been reported to the EPISTLE editors. Those interested in specific positions should communicate directly with the contact person listed.

* * * * * *

Institution: State University of New York at Albany

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Candidate should have at least three years experience as an elementary or secondary teacher; recent contact with secondary reading programs and clinics (urban preferred) and some knowledge of adult reading programs.

Responsibilities: Teach graduate courses in reading including secondary and adult; share with other department members the construction of modules and the development of basic competencies; assist in advisement and direction of sixty-hour and doctoral students.

Starting Date: Fall 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. J. Roy Newton
Chairman, Reading Department
State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

Telephone: (518) 457-8242

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of Texas at Austin

Position: Elementary Education and Reading

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Three to five years elementary classroom experience; diagnostic and/or remedial reading.

Responsibilities: On-site competency-based elementary teacher education.

Starting Date: August 27, 1975

Salary: $12,000 (negotiable)

Other Benefits: Usual academic fringe benefits

Contact Person: Dr. William A. Bennie, Chairman
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Telephone: (512) 471-5942

Additional Information: Contact Dr. William Harmer, Director, Learning Disabilities Center, The University of Texas at Austin, 78712.

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of Texas at Austin

Position: Elementary Education and Reading, Bilingual (English-Spanish)

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Three to five years elementary classroom experience, including bilingual instruction; diagnostic and/or remedial reading.

Responsibilities: On-site competency-based elementary teacher education with an emphasis on bilingual reading (Spanish-English).

Starting Date: August 27, 1975

Salary: $12,000 for nine months (negotiable)

Other Benefits: Usual academic fringe benefits

Contact Person: Dr. William A. Bennie, Chairman
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Telephone: (512) 471-5942

Additional Information: Contact Dr. William A. Harmer, Director, Learning Disabilities Center, The University of Texas at Austin, 78712.

* * * * * *

Institution: Kansas State University

Position: Reading/Language Arts

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate with reading specialization

Experience Desired: At least two years successful experience as an elementary teacher.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate elementary school reading and language arts courses; supervise elementary student teachers; engage in graduate program development in reading at off-campus centers.

Starting Date: September, 1975

Salary: $12,500

Contact Person: Dr. Mary Harris , Chair of Search Committee
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506

Telephone: (913) 532-5550

Additional Information: Personal interviews will be conducted at the AACTE meetings in Chicago, February 26 to March 1; interviews will be arranged on campus for qualified applicants selected by a committee of the faculty.

Please include a one-page letter explaining professional goals with credentials when applying.

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Florida

Position: Reading

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Elementary or middle school desired.

Responsibilities: In-service work through Teacher's Center; a campus course in reading.

Starting Date: (Hopefully) January/February

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. William R. Powell
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Telephone: (904) 392-0719

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Northern Iowa

Position: Director, Reading Clinic

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Classroom teaching, clinical experience, college teaching.

Responsibilities: Supervising clinic operations, teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in remedial reading.

Starting Date: June or September, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Ned Ratekin, Director
Division of Reading
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Telephone: (319) 273-2167

EDITORIAL COMMENT

How is your departmental budget? Inflated downward 20% in purchasing power? Cut 5% as an economy move? Eroded by rising utility bills? Paperless? Travel-less? Less of everything? And what about students? Up??? Nationally that seems to be the story, more students to teach on the same (or even less) budget. At least that appears to be the case for undergraduate and certain graduate and professional programs. But look around the campus and you will undoubtedly find several nearly studentless programs still continuing at their old budget levels while you strain to carry the load which has shifted from these areas of lowered employability.

In the search to categorize and explain low achieving students, the ultimate in both common sense and ignorance has been achieved. Children experiencing difficulty in reading are reported to also have a high incidence of language disorder. In case you have not heard, language disorder is generally described as immature language development with symptoms including limited speaking vocabulary and language reasoning ability. Oh, you say, any remedial reading teacher could have told you that? And what is the cure? Something akin to the kind of reading readiness programs which have been developed for culturally different students during the past fifteen years? And doesn't the research indicate that these efforts worked? Then why the arrival of the Language Disorder specialist and, of course, state level certification for same?

While on the topic of problems, how about your field-based competency training program? Do you find difficulty combining the concepts of field-based and competency? If not, have you looked at the teachers with whom your student-teachers will work and no doubt model? Initial findings indicate a glaring need for quality control of teacher models. There is a grave danger in the concept that spending time in schools with "seasoned" teachers is an adequate replacement for sound teacher training courses.

RAP

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE . . . . (December, 1974)

As this issue goes to press, the USA has its first non-elected President and Vice-President, plus one Earl of Butz. Now for three pieces of good news: the Constitutional process works; THE CIA, long in charge of National (in)Security, is itself under investigation by Nelson Rockefeller, our most prominent man in securiti(es); and Congressional rule by senility has finally been challenged. Requiescat in pace.

Several experimental psychologists are gaining national attention for progress in teaching monkeys to talk. Seems they are in for quite a disappointment when they discover how little monkeys have to say. Although one poor mon(k)ey-man named Wilbur is said to have been severly negatively reinforced for having too much to say.

In sports. Johnny Miller is clubbing them all on the pro golf tour--11 wins in his last 14 outings. Muhammed Ali can't find anyone to club. And Dan Devine, rejected by his Club, took up with a notre Dame. The WFL considered suicide, but thought it might appear redundant.

The ick-conomy has caught a resistant strain of viral infection, said to be of Arabian origin. The prescription is a two sided sword. Black pills relieve the headache but induce nausea. White ones settle the stomach but wreak havoc in the head. One of each causes vertigo. No need to fret though, Henry Kiss-en-go is working on the OY(L) WELL(!) of the problem.

Recent Awards: Telly Savallas, T.V. actor of the year; Bob Hope, Comic of the Century; Orson Welles, most successful renegade; and would you believe, Holiday Inns for EXTRAordinary good taste in exterior design? (Don't)

Look in again for another page in this our unfinished journey . . .

AVM

LATE NEWS NOTES:

Positions in addition to those listed; University of North Carolina (Greensboro) - contact Patrick Mattern; University of Arkansas (Fayetteville) - contact David C. Smith; and University of Georgia (Athens) - secondary reading - contact George Mason.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert A. Palmatier (Ph.D., Syracuse University, 1968) is an Associate Professor of Reading Education at the University of Georgia. In addition to serving as chairman of PRTE, Dr. Palmatier is President of the Northeast Georgia Council of the IRA. At the University he specializes in secondary reading, directs a Right To Read Community Based Project, and advises doctoral candidates.

Anthony V. Manzo (Ph.D., Syracuse University, 1969) served as the first secretary/treasurer of PRTE and continues as Coordinating Editor of EPISTLE. As an Associate Professor at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, Dr. Manzo directs the Learning Resources staff, teaches graduate courses, and advises doctoral candidates. He has been active in a variety of adult and secondary school education projects.

Jack L. Burtch, et. al. are new graduates who have only this year begun their post-doctoral professional careers in reading. In order to maintain the shield of anonymity for the institutions from which they recently graduated, and in this issue have evaluated, the editors have chosen to forego enumeration of their academic and professional backgrounds.

Richard Allington (Ph.D., Michigan State University, 1973) teaches graduate reading courses in secondary reading and diagnosis and remediation, as an Assistant Professor at the State University of New York at Albany. Dr. Allington is a past winner of an IRA Distinguished Dissertation Award.

next issue . . .

reflections on guiding dissertations from Helen Robinson, Jaap Tuinman, Edwin Smith, Billy Guice and others, and an analysis of dissertations involving reading by Robert Palmatier and Ellen Austin.

regular features . . .

EXCHANGE

EDITORIAL COMMENT

TIME CAPSULE

JOB REPORT